This is supposed to be the statement made by the Hon. Chief Minister on the floor of this House. That is not in accordance with the record of the proceedings, nor is this true. Therefore with regard to ' B ' also, a *prima facie* case exists.

In the same paper another portion marked ' C ' reads like this—

'காமராஜ், பக்தவத்சலம், கருத்திருமன் தவிர மற்றவர்கள் வயிற்றுப் பிழைப்புக்காரர்கள் என்று முதன் மந்திரி சொன்னது சட்டசபையில் பணியாற்றும் மீதி 49 காங்கிரஸ் மெம்பர்களையும் இழிவு படுத்துவதாகும்.'

This is the statement which is alleged to have been made by the Leader of the Opposition. But he has already said that he has not made it. Therefore in all these three cases contained in the issue of 7th July 1967 I have to hold that a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege exists.

Immediately I do not send it to the Committee of Privileges. It is not as though I am bound to send to the Committee of privileges in every case where a *prima facie* case of breach of privilege is made out. I can dispose of it also in another way. Under Rule 189 I can ask this House to deal with it. We have got to remember that breach of privilege is a weapon of enormous power and should be exercised with due restraint. This House, I have repeatedly stated, is the most powerful institution in this State, and any newspaper cannot, in any sense, be regarded as an adversary of this House. So, if the publisher expresses regret or if the publisher is penitent or if the publisher shows—to use the word mentioned in May's Parliamentary Practice—Contrition, this House can be magnanimous. Being magnanimous will only add to the prestige of the House. Only the strong can afford to be lenient and no one will accuse us of weakness if we show leniency. Therefore having held that a *prima facie* case does exist in respect of all the three portions marked and brought to the notice of the House, I have to see whether I would deal with it by sending it to the Committee of Privileges or whether I would deal with it on the floor of the House itself and that will depend upon what the publisher says in the meantime. I adjourn this matter to the 18th of this month to allow time to the publisher and to see whether he expresses regret or will be penitent or will show contrition.

(உ) சென்னை நகர போலீஸ்கமிஷனர் தீ விபத்துக்கள்பற்றி விடுத்த அறிக்கை.

MR. SPEAKER: Another matter is about the privilege raised against Commissioner of Police by Mr. V. K. Kothandaraman. I have received certain information from the Government, but I have to receive some more. Therefore I adjourn the matter to the 17th of this month for giving my final ruling.